

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated January 8, 2008, claims 1-34 were pending in this application. Applicants also acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 2-16 and 18-32 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of allowable claim 15, and allowable dependent claims 2, 7, and 16 have been placed into independent form.

Applicants have amended claim 1 and cancelled claims 17-34 to remove these claims from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

**CLAIMS 1, 17, AND 33-34 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON FREEMAN, U.S. PATENT NO. 6,330,588, IN VIEW OF NAJORK ET AL., U.S. PATENT
NO. 6,263,364 HEREINAFTER NAJORK)**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of claim 15, and claims 17 and 33-34 have been deleted. Thus, the Examiner's rejection as to these claims is moot.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: April 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/
Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
Phone: (561) 922-3845
CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320